

# CITY OF LODI

# **COUNCIL COMMUNICATION**

**AGENDA TITLE:** 

Authorization to Participate in Joint Countywide Feasibility

Study to Explore Options for Animal Shelter Operations

**MEETING DATE:** 

March 1, 2000

PREPARED BY:

City Manager

RECOMMENDATION:

That the City Council authorize the expenditure of \$5130 in order for the City to participate in a joint Countywide feasibility study to explore options for Animal Shelters with the cities of Stockton, Manteca, Tracy, Lathrop, Escalon,

and Ripon and the County of San Joaquin.

**BACKGROUND:** 

The proposed study, conducted by a consultant, would explore the options for all animal control and animal shelter services in the

county under a Joint Powers Authority, consortium, or similar agreement. Many of the shelter facilities around the County are either antiquated or undersized, and

Lodi's Facility as well is overcrowded and in need of renovation.

In addition, new legislation (the Hayden Bill) took effect July 1, 1999. The bill, among other things, dramatically increased the amount of time shelters are required to hold animals. The impact on our shelter, as well as others in the County is significant.

Participation in the study carries no further obligation for our City, but staff would have adequate information to consider the options explored by the study. Attached is a letter from the County requesting Lodi's participation in the project along with a summary of the work-scope for the study.

FUNDING: \$5130; Contingency Fund

PREPARED BY: Janet L. Hamilton

Respectfully submitted

H. Dixon Flynn City Manager

cc: Larry Hansen, Police Chief

APPROVED: H. Dixon Flynn -- City Manager Office of the County Administrator



Courthouse, Room 707 222 East Weber Avenue Stockton, California 95202–2778 (209) 468–3211 Janet H

August 20, 1999

Dixon Flynn Lodi City Manager P. O. Box 3006 Lodi, CA 95241-1910

Dear Dixon:

## Workscope for Animal Control Study

At the Management and Finance Committee, Council of Governments, meeting on August 18, 1999, a discussion was held regarding the workscope of the proposed Animal Control study. This correspondence is intended to confirm the outcome of the discussion and to ensure common understanding of the proposed project scope among the meeting attendees and their respective agencies.

Attached is a summary of the anticipated tasks to be performed by the consultant(s). Also attached is a revised cost breakdown based on an **estimated** study cost of \$50,000. Please review these documents and notify me, or Management Analyst Rod Kawano, as soon as possible if you desire any changes.

Mr. Kawano has been assigned to assist Lathrop City Attorney Susan Cochran in finalizing the study workscope, obtaining a revised cost proposal from the consultant, and in preparing a Memorandum of Understanding for the project participants.

Thank you for your assistance.

11 1/1/1/1

Very truly yours,

David L. Baker County Administrator

DLB:RK

Attachments

c: John Bingham, Lathrop City Manager Bob Adams, Manteca City Manager

DB08-10

# **Summary Of Anticipated Workscope For Animal Control Study**

# • Determine Basic Issues Impacting Potential Service Delivery Approaches and Alternatives

Interview key representatives from the various agencies to discuss service approaches, attitudes toward service improvements, service delivery goals, key problems, and participation in various services (shelter services, spay/neuter, field patrol, licensing).

Refine service alternatives to be evaluated in the study such as joint operations, operations that require multiple facilities and governance structures, contracting by service type, future relationships with other animal services agencies.

Consultant would **not** address attitudes towards service improvements through increasing avenues for input and/or control of service delivery and cost structure; or concerns about service costs, available revenues, and current cost allocation approaches.

## Evaluate the Condition and Reuse Potential of Existing Facilities

Evaluate physical and functional condition of facilities relative to existing and projected programs. Existing facility plans shall be provided by participating agencies.

## Document Current Services and Service Demands

Necessary data shall be provided by participating agencies. Data to be provided to consultant may include: facility capacity, size, condition, utilization, deficiencies, and operations provided; shelter intake, patterns, sources, disposition, and average population levels from each facility; basic services provided, staffing, service hours, and field patrol data.

Consultant would **not** address vehicle/equipment suitability or adequacy of current licensing programs.

## Project Shelter Facility Requirements for a Regional Operation and for Shelters sized to serve Individual or Identified Agencies

Define shelter capacity requirements necessary to accommodate regionally generated demand to the Year 2020, including impact of SB1785. Project space needs by facility component, site requirements, estimate costs, and develop capital budget for new construction or remodeling of an existing facility. Compare requirements, costs for a shelter sized and operated to serve entire region with shelters serving different combinations of neighboring jurisdictions.

Consultant would **not** estimate land acquisition costs.

# • Project and Evaluate Organizational Structures and Operational Requirements Needed to Deliver Animal Services under the various Alternate Approaches

Develop estimates of potential operating costs including staffing, maintenance and operations, support costs, and start—up costs of alternatives. Assess operational and community impact of various models including staffing, travel time, spay/neuter and other clinic services, and customer convenience. Develop cost allocation methodologies, evaluate contracted services, multi-facility operations, and various governance and financing approaches.

## • Develop a Non-Site Specific Plan

Develop non-site specific plan based on data collected and test plan on up to 3 sites.

• Prepare a Proposed Schedule for Implementing the Preferred Alternative

Outline specific steps for implementation of preferred alternative.

	POPULATION	554,500		ESTIMATE *	50,000.00
	-	POPULATION (Dept of Finance 01/01/99)	%		PROPOSED NEW WORKSCOPE COST (proportionally shared)
ESCALON		5,725	1.03%	\$	515.00
LATHROP		9,525	1.72%		860.00
LODI		56,900	10.26%		5,130.00
MANTECA		48,050	8.67%		4,335.00
RIPON		10,000	1.80%		900.00
STOCKTON		243,700	43.95%		21,975.00
TRACY		50,300	9.07%		4,535.00
UNINCORPORATEL		130,300	23.50%		11,750.00
		554,500	100.00%	\$	50,000.00

#### \* Estimate assumes:

- Interviews limited to one day.
- Consultant would not address attitudes towards service improvements through increasing avenues for input and/or control of service delivery and cost structure; or concerns about service costs, available revenues, and current cost allocation approaches.
- Participants would provide:
  - Plans of existing facilities
  - Data necessary to determine workload and service demand such as:
    - Current information (capacity, size, condition, utilization, deficiencies, services provided, staffing)
    - Shelter intake, patterns, sources, disposition, average population levels from each facility
    - Services provided, staffing, service hours, field patrol data
- Consultant would not address vehicle/equipment suitability or adequacy of current licensing programs.
- Consultant would not estimate land acquisition costs.
- DMG-Maximus would be willing to perform additional tasks (Task 5, 7) based on costs in original proposal:
  - Project and evaluate organizational structures and operational requirements needed to deliver animal services under the various alternate approaches.
  - Estimate operating costs (line staffing, management/supervisory/support staff, operating costs, maintenance costs, start-up costs, operational/community impact of various models.
  - Develop cost allocation methodologies
  - Compare contract operation, perform service impact evaluation
  - Evaluate various governance and financing models

#### RESOLUTION NO. 2000-30

# A RESOLUTION OF THE LODI CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZING THE PARTICIPATION IN JOINT COUNTYWIDE FEASIBILITY STUDY TO EXPLORE OPTIONS FOR ANIMAL SHELTER OPERATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lodi City Council does hereby authorize the expenditure of \$5,130.00 for the City to participate in a joint Countywide feasibility study to explore options for Animal Shelters with the cities of Stockton, Manteca, Tracy, Lathrop, Escalon, and Ripon and the County of San Joaquin.

Dated: March 1, 2000

I hereby certify that Resolution No. 2000-30 was passed and adopted by the Lodi City Council in a regular meeting held March 1, 2000 by the following vote:

AYES:

COUNCIL MEMBERS - Hitchcock, Land, Pennino and Mann (Mayor)

NOES:

COUNCIL MEMBERS - Nakanishi

ABSENT:

COUNCIL MEMBERS - None

ABSTAIN:

COUNCIL MEMBERS - None

City Clerk

Mice In Buncle ALICE M. REIMCHE